

Ser. No. 10/646,869

Docket No. 1293.1837

REMARKS**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****OCT 26 2007****INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 20, 24 and 26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25 and 27 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-17, 19, 21-23, 25, and 27 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S JANUARY 16, 2007 ARGUMENTS:

The Examiner provided his responses to Applicant's January 1, 2006 response.

In view of the following amendments and arguments, the Examiner's responses are respectfully submitted to be overcome.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

In the Office Action, at page 3, numbered paragraph 8, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 13 has been amended to change "the memory unit" to recite —a memory unit—. Hence, amended claim 13 is submitted to be in allowable form under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

A. In the Office Action, at pages 3-16, numbered paragraph 10, claims 1-6, 8-17, 19-21 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373; hereafter, Ohyama) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515; hereafter, Chang). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended for clarity to add the terminology: "wherein the major function information is set based on at least one function which is frequently used in the image processing apparatus, and the additional function information is set based on at least one function which is not frequently used in the image processing apparatus, to minimize a number of buttons on the remote control," based for example, on paragraph [0020] of the specification.

Ser. No. 10/646,869

Docket No. 1283.1837

Independent claims 13 and 21 have been amended in similar fashion. Independent claim 20 and dependent claim 26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 27 have also been amended (see above) for clarity.

It is respectfully submitted that Ohyama teaches the use of a large number of buttons, including numerical buttons, on a remote commander in contrast to the use of a minimized number of buttons on a remote control of the present invention. Hence, Ohyama teaches away from the present invention by teaching the use of a large number of buttons, including the use of numeric buttons. Also, as admitted by the Examiner, Ohyama does not expressly disclose that the additional function information stored in the memory unit is categorized as such based on the frequency of use of the information or that the additional function information stored in the memory unit is updated whenever the functions of the image processing apparatus are updated or a new function is added to the image processing apparatus.

Although Chang adapts the user interface based on how frequently certain features are used, Chang teaches the use of a user interface with a display on the user interface to control an electronic device that is further coupled to a television, i.e., teaches the indirect control of a television. In contrast, as illustrated in FIG. 1 and described in paragraph [0029] of the specification, the present invention utilizes a simplified remote control to display, on a display unit of an AV system, the additional function information, including the numeric displays, to be utilized to control the AV system directly. Hence, Chang teaches a more complex apparatus than the apparatus of the present invention. That is, the remote control unit of the present invention makes use of the display of the AV system to display the additional information and the numeric displays. In contrast to the present invention, Chang teaches controlling a television via a set-top box, as opposed to the direct control offered by the simplified remote control of the present invention. Hence, Chang teaches away from the present invention.

Thus, amended independent claims 1, 13 and 21 of the present invention, and the claims depending therefrom, recite technical features of controlling the additional function information based on the displayed additional function information if the remote control signal is a signal for requesting the additional function information and controlling a function corresponding to major function information to be performed if the remote control signal is the major function information, wherein the major function information is set based on at least one function which is frequently used in the image processing apparatus, and the additional function information is set based on at least one function which is not frequently used in the image processing apparatus, to minimize the number of buttons of the remote control, in contrast to the cited references, which do not teach or suggest such technical features.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that since each of Ohyama and Chang teaches away

Ser. No. 10/646,869

Docket No. 1293.1837.

from the present invention, the combination of Ohyama and Chang teaches away from the present invention. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21 are not taught or suggested by Ohyama and Chang, alone or in combination, and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515). Since claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-17, 19, 25 and 27 depend from amended independent claims 1, 13 and 21, respectively, claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-17, 19, 25 and 27 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515) for at least the reasons amended independent claims 1, 13 and 21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515).

B. In the Office Action, at pages 16-17, numbered paragraph 11, claims 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373; hereafter, Ohyama) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515; hereafter, Chang) and further in view of Bradley et al. (USPN 6,574,798; hereafter, Bradley). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 24 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Bradley teaches a system and controller for control and distribution of audio and video signals wherein if a remote control signal not stored in a memory unit is received, a controller ignores the remote control signal.

However, Bradley, as recited in the Abstract of Bradley, recited below for the convenience of the Examiner, does not teach or suggest controlling a television set with a remote control, as is done by the present invention, but rather controls a television appliance to function together with the television to authorize a television appliance to supply certain programs to the television for certain periods of time, and thus teaches away from the present invention:

The object of the invention is to provide a system and controller for distribution of audio/video signals on a pay-for-use basis, to a customer in a controlled environment such as a motel, hotel, bus station, bar or apartment building. The system includes a global authorization computer which transmits authorization to the customer over a telephone line. The customer has a telephone line/television control interface which receives the dual-tone multi-frequency authorization and allows the customer to select the authorized channel for a defined length of time. Without authorization, the telephone line/television control interface will deny the customer's attempt to tune his television to a pay-for-use channel. When the authorized time expires, the telephone line/television control interface tunes the customer's television to a non-pay-for-use channel. Additional options and embodiments are also presented. (emphasis added)

Thus, Bradley does not teach or suggest an apparatus for controlling functions of an

Ser. No. 10/646,869

Docket No. 1293.1837

image processing apparatus using a remote control, the apparatus comprising: a remote control signal receiver receiving a remote control signal output from the remote control; a memory unit storing code information corresponding to the remote control signal and additional function information of the image processing apparatus determined based on the frequency of use of the image processing apparatus; a controller controlling the additional function information stored in the memory unit to be displayed and controlling an additional function that is selected based on the displayed additional function information to be performed if the remote control signal received via the remote control signal receiver is a signal for requesting the additional function information, and controlling a function corresponding to a major function information to be performed if the remote control signal is the major function information; a display unit displaying the additional function information controlled by the controller, and the additional function information stored in the memory unit is updated whenever the functions of the image processing apparatus are updated or a new function is added to the image processing apparatus, wherein the major function information is set based on at least one function which is frequently used in the image processing apparatus, and the additional function information is set based on at least one function which is not frequently used in the image processing apparatus, to minimize a number of buttons on the remote control, as is recited in amended independent claim 1, and similarly in amended independent claims 13, and 21 of the present invention.

As noted above, amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515). Clearly, Bradley teaches using a remote control device to control interoperation of a television appliance with a television, does not teach the apparatus, method, and/or system for controlling functions of an image processing apparatus using a remote control of the present invention, and thus teaches away from the present invention.

Thus, the combination of Ohyama, Chang and Bradley does not teach or suggest amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21 of the present invention or the claims depending therefrom (claims 3-6, 8-12, and 15-19, 22-23, and 25), and amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515) and further in view of Bradley et al. (USPN 6,574,798). Hence, claims 22, 23 and 25 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515) and further in view of Bradley et al. (USPN 6,574,798) for at least the reasons amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515) and further in view of Bradley et al. (USPN 6,574,798).

Ser. No. 10/646,869

Docket No. 1293.1837

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 26, 2007By: Darleen J. Hockley
Darleen J. Hockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1480, Alexandria, VA 22313-1480
on October 26, 2007
By: Darleen J. Hockley
Date: October 26, 2007